

Health care is in need of reform. It costs too much, and not enough Americans receive it. The Republican alternative provides for that. The Democratic alternative does not.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

REASONS TO LEAVE AFGHANISTAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, this morning I was honored to go with five other Members, three Democrats and three Republicans, to have breakfast at the Pentagon with Secretary of Defense Robert Gates. The Secretary is a kind man and this was a very nice thing for him to do. I have great respect for Secretary Gates.

The purpose of the breakfast was to discuss the situation in Afghanistan. When I got this invitation, I wondered if I should go, since I have been very much opposed to our war there. However, I decided that the only right and fair thing to do was to go listen to what he had to say.

Unfortunately, I still believe that what we are doing in Afghanistan is a horrendous waste that we cannot afford. I also believe that Afghanistan is no realistic threat to us, unless our war there continues to anger so many people around the world.

George C. Wilson, military columnist for Congress Daily, wrote recently: "The American military's mission to pacify the 40,000 tiny villages in Afghanistan will look like mission impossible, especially if our bombings keep killing Afghan civilians and infuriating the ones who survive."

General Petraeus said this summer we should not forget that Afghanistan has been known as the "graveyard of empires."

Congressional Quarterly reported on September 17 that members of both parties were "fretting openly about a lack of progress in the conflict."

As much as Americans love our troops, we need to realize that the Defense Department is not just a military organization. It is also the world's largest bureaucracy. Every gigantic bureaucracy always wants to expand its mission and frequently exaggerates its challenges so it can get more money and personnel.

The Taliban guerillas have almost no money, and a top U.N. antiterrorism official said recently that al Qaeda is having "difficulty in maintaining credibility."

National defense is the most legitimate function of our Federal Govern-

ment. However, that does not mean Congress should automatically or blindly approve the Pentagon's every request or never criticize its waste.

Much of what we are doing in Afghanistan is of a civic, charitable or governmental nature, like building schools and teaching agribusiness. But the Defense Department should not be the "Department of Foreign Aid," or much of our military primarily a very large version of the Peace Corps.

In March, the President promised a "dramatic increase" in our effort in Afghanistan, including "agricultural specialists and educators, engineers and lawyers." Why, when we are \$12 trillion in debt, are we spending mega-billions in Afghanistan doing practically everything for them? We are spending money we do not have on a very unnecessary war and jeopardizing our own future in the process.

Many people think that all conservatives support this war. Well, I believe that there are many millions of conservatives who do not and who want us to bring our troops home, the sooner the better. In fact, this war goes very much against traditional conservatism.

When I was in high school, I worked as a bag boy at an A&P grocery store making \$1.10 an hour. I sent my first paycheck, \$19 and some cents, as a contribution to the Barry Goldwater campaign. I am still one of the most conservative Members of Congress.

But this war has required huge deficit spending, almost half a trillion in war and war-related costs for Afghanistan. Fiscal conservatives should be the people most upset about this. This war has spent mega-billions in foreign aid, because probably at least half of what we have done and are doing there is of a civic or charitable nature. Traditional conservatives have been the strongest opponents of massive foreign aid.

□ 1845

We went into the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan under U.N. resolutions, yet conservatives have traditionally been the biggest critics of the U.N. Conservatives have traditionally been the biggest opponents of world government because it is too elitist and arrogant and too far removed from control by the people. We should not now support what is essentially world government just because it is being run by our military.

I am a veteran and I am very pro military, but I am for national defense, not international defense. I know that the leaders of Afghanistan want us to keep spending hundreds of billions there, but we cannot afford it. We cannot afford it economically, and as far as I am concerned, it is not worth one more American life.

I know that when leaders of the Defense Department and the State Department and the National Security Council all get together in their meetings, that all of the pressures are on getting involved or staying involved in

just about every military, political or ethnic dispute all around the world. I know that they want to be considered as great world statesmen, but 8 years in Afghanistan is not only enough, it is far too long. It is time, Madam Speaker, to come home. It is time to start putting our own people and our own country first once again.

FIGHTING FOR DEMOCRACY AND HUMAN RIGHTS IN CUBA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Speaker, I had the privilege a few days ago to speak by telephone with one of the great heroes that fight for democracy and human rights in Cuba, Jorge Luis Garcia Perez, "Antunez." He is in the city of Placetas in Cuba. His house is surrounded by thugs of the dictatorship. He is continuously harassed, often detained, has spent 17 years as a political prisoner, and was recently released. Yet he continues his fight, peacefully, nonviolently, against the totalitarian system in Cuba, in that island that has been forgotten by the world, and yet its people continue to suffer under the yoke of a brutal, totalitarian, nightmarish regime led by a dictator who is infirm now, he is sick. By virtue of that, he has turned over some titles, titles of power to his brother, but yet he retains, Fidel Castro, retains absolute personal power, total power in that totalitarian fiefdom.

His brother receives visitors, heads of state and has some titles of power, but be not mistaken, the totalitarian power remains in the hands of Fidel Castro, who, for example, is the one that orders that heroes like Antunez be detained or released, that heroes such as Oscar Elias Biscet or Rolando Arroyo or Pedro Arguelles Moran or Normando Hernandez or Ariel Sigler Amaya or Librado Linares or Horacio Pina or Ricardo Gonzalez Alfonso or Hector Maceda or Felix Navarro or Rafael Ibarra and countless others be retained in the gulag being tortured simply because those heroes support the ability for the Cuban people to have the rights, for example, that the American people, or free people throughout the world have.

Jorge Luis Garcia Perez told me, when I spoke to him on the phone about the fact that his wife's brother, his wife is Iris Perez Aguilera, and she is also a fantastic, formidable freedom fighter. Her brother, Mario Perez Aguilera, is in the gulag being tortured, and is being denied access, visits by his family. In other words, Iris cannot visit her brother who is in horrible physical condition. We don't know how gravely ill, but we know he is very ill, and he is being denied access. His family cannot visit them.

So I told Antunez that I would come to this floor and use the great privilege

given to me by my constituents to tell the world about the brutality that Mario Perez Aguilera, that political prisoner, and the many others, that they are facing day in and day out, and the added inhumanity of not being able to be seen by their family members.

The island that the world ignores. And what is most tragic is that it is 90 miles from our shores and for over 50 years, it has been in the grasp of a demented despot who orders such actions as the ones I have discussed this evening.

So I will continue to denounce the brutality, the inhumanity, and I will also continue to remind the world that despite that brutality, Cuba will soon be free.

To be continued.

NO FEDERAL FUNDING FOR ABORTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, there was a wonderful gathering in Washington today of thousands of people from all over the country. Many of those people held up signs that said Abortion is Not Health Care. The American public is more intelligent than those in charge in this House.

Pro-life Members here in the House are continuing to stand up and speak out for the unborn, and we will, until we defeat this bill or stop Federal funds from being used for abortions through this bill. Pro-life Members have offered amendments to the majority's original health care plan, H.R. 3200, to permanently exclude Federal funding of abortion. All of these amendments were rejected by the majority. Minority whip CANTOR's amendment to stop health care from funding abortion was rejected in the Ways and Means Committee on July 16, 2009. Representative SOUDER's amendment to stop abortion funding was rejected by the majority in the Education and Labor Committee on July 17, 2009.

Democrat Representative BART STUPAK and Republican Representative JOE PITTS offered another amendment to stop abortion funding in Energy and Commerce, and the majority rejected it on July 30, 2009. The reasons given by the majority for rejecting these amendments was that they were not needed as there was no abortion funding in the bill.

Now the contrast to that is the Republican substitute which will be offered has a permanent, government-wide Hyde amendment, meaning unequivocally, no Federal funds can be used for abortion anywhere in any bill that passes. Yet despite claims from the majority that abortion funding was not in the bill, the Energy and Commerce Committee voted on July 31, 2009, to include the Capps amendment to explicitly include abortion funding in the health care bill.

Recently, Speaker PELOSI unveiled H.R. 3962, her 2,000 page \$1.3 trillion government takeover of health care. This bill also includes the Capps amendment, which will increase the number of elective abortions and gut the well-established government policy that prevents Federal funds from being used to pay for elective abortion known as the Hyde amendment.

Before the Hyde amendment was passed in 1976, Medicaid funded almost 300,000 abortions. In contrast, the Republican substitute again has a permanent government-wide Hyde amendment, meaning unequivocally, no Federal funds for abortion anywhere.

Section 222 of H.R. 3962 permits Federal funds to be used for abortion in the government insurance plan.

Section 4(a) refers to elective abortion procedures that are otherwise prohibited from receiving Federal funds in other government programs due to current Hyde amendment policies, but cannot be prohibited in the government-run public insurance plan.

Supporters of the bill assert that only private funds will be used to fund abortion in the government-run public insurance plan. This is not true. The bill places individual premium payments for the government-run public insurance plan into a Federal treasury account that may be used to pay for abortions. The bill also federally subsidizes private insurance plans that cover abortion in the government-run exchange.

Let there be no doubt that Pelosi's plan explicitly authorizes the government-run public insurance plan to pay for elective abortions and subsidizes private plans on the government-run exchange that cover elective abortion. Despite assurance from the majority that something would be done to correct this, the manager's amendment for H.R. 3962 does not contain any language regarding abortion funding.

The proposal outlined by Representative BRAD ELLSWORTH of Indiana yesterday falls short of addressing these issues. In his plan, the government-run public insurance plan would still cover abortion, but would have to contract with private contractors to carry out the administrative functions related to paying for elective abortion. Rather than reducing the number of abortions, the majority seems content with overseeing legislation to create the largest expansion of abortion since Roe v. Wade. This is unacceptable.

Pro-life Members on both sides of the aisle want the opportunity to vote on the Stupak-Pitts amendment to apply the Hyde amendment and exclude the abortion funding in Pelosi's plan. The American people understand this. We should not be using our Federal funding to kill innocent life.

HEALTH CARE RALLY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, an extraordinary thing happened here today, right out here down the hill. There were tens of thousands of people that came out on very short notice. They came out, and these were not the super wealthy. These weren't the Wall Street folks that if you will check, give four to one to Democrats over Republicans. These people didn't care about party at all. They were concerned about the America that they knew, an America where people were given a chance to succeed and a chance to fail. Because as people far more wise than I am have noted over the years, any government that can take away your chance to fail has taken away your chance to succeed.

So people came out on very short notice. These were working people. You could see these were not people of leisure. These were people who had jobs, but they felt like this was something so critical they had to come, make their voices heard. You see them around offices all over the Capitol Hill area.

□ 1900

It was immensely moving. And the way the people all said the pledge to the flag at the start and honored the prayer as it was said to start the proceedings. And I don't know that I have ever heard a group sing the National Anthem with such fervor as a group. It was immensely touching because the people were up here to let their voices be heard and to let people know that the government does not need to take over 18 percent of this country's economy. Haven't we messed up the car companies enough? Haven't we messed up the banks and the lenders and the housing market enough that we're not satisfied yet until we take over 18 percent of the world's economy and muck it up as well? Do we really have to meddle and take over that kind of thing?

The role of the government should be as a referee, not as a player. We shouldn't be out there taking over businesses. You want to speed up the demise of a country, then let the government start becoming the player. Now, the Soviet Union was brutal enough and totalitarian enough. They were able to make a socialist form of government last for 70 years, as a record. Extraordinary. But they were brutal and totalitarian enough, they could force it that far. We won't last that long, not when we've moved the government in charge of everything.

Under the bill—I haven't gotten through the full bill, but I have seen some things that are staggering. I do remember hearing a number of our Nation's leaders saying that there was no way Federal dollars would be paying for abortion, so let me just read straight from page 110, subsection B, titled, Abortions for Which Public Funding is Allowed. And I'm reading the quote from page 110: The services described in this subparagraph are